

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 6 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended.

Claims 1 – 6 were rejected under Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the examiner objected to certain claim language contained in claims 1 and 6. The examiner has also stated that claims 1 – 6 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under Section 112. Applicant therefore has amended claims 1 and 6 in the following manner.

The limitation of claim 1 regarding the cut and the rejected reference to “the reverse face thereof” has been amended to read: “a cut is formed in a position surrounding the opening of each recess such that the cut penetrates the laminated film from a face of the laminated film opposite the sheet-like thermoformed body in a thickness direction thereof but does not penetrate the sheet-like thermoformed body in the thickness direction thereof.” This amendment makes it more clear which face applicant is referring to. The examiner’s interpretation that the “reverse face” found on line 17 of prior claim 1 is the face of the laminated film that is not facing toward the thermoformed body is correct. The amendment to claim 1 reflects this interpretation.

Claim 6 has been amended to read: “The blister pack according to claim 1, wherein said laminated film comprises a polyethylene film layer bonded to said polyethylene terephthalate film layer by dry lamination, and said film layer composed of a blend material consisting of an ethylene/vinyl acetate copolymer resin and an olefin resin is laminated to the polyethylene film layer.” This amendment makes it clear that the polyethylene terephthalate film layer and the blend-material film layer referred to in claim 6 are the same layers referred to in claim 1. Claim 6 adds a third layer to the laminated film, that being a polyethylene layer in between the polyethylene terephthalate layer and the blend-material layer. The polyethylene layer is dry laminated to the polyethylene terephthalate layer and the blend-material layer is laminated to the polyethylene layer. This



U.S. Application No. 10/057,174 -- 6

arrangement is disclosed on page 7, lines 16 - 23 of the specification and in Figures 5 and 6 of the drawings.

The examiner has also objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as failing to show a cut (7 or 17) which does not penetrate the sheet-like thermoformed body, as required by claim 1 and as described on page 6, lines 8 - 10 and on page 8, lines 12 - 14 of the specification. Applicant has amended Figures 2, 4, 5 and 6 accordingly. Replacement drawing sheets for Figures 2, 4, 5 and 6 are attached hereto. Applicant submits that the drawings are now acceptable.

This amendment and request for reconsideration is felt to be fully responsive to the comments and suggestions of the examiner and to place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Yukihiko Shibata

Fildes & Outland, P.C.

Christopher J. Fildes, Attorney
Registration No. 32,132
20916 Mack Avenue, Suite 2
Grosse Pointe Woods, MI 48236
(313) 885-1500